The Intercollegiate Socialist

December-January, 1915-16 — Ten Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Harry W. Laidler, Editor

Published bi-monthly, except June, July, August and September

Entered as second class matter June 20, 1913, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City

10c. a copy — Subscription, 25c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi
Alberta (Can.)
Albion
American International
Amherst
Barnard
Bates
Berkeley Divinity
Bowdoin
Brown
California
Carnegie Inst. Technology
Chicago
Cincinnati
City College (N. Y.)
Clark
Colgate
Colorado
Columbia
Cornell
Denison
Fargo Agricultural
Florida
George Washington
Hamilton
Hamline
Harvard
Howard
Illinois
Indiana
John Marshall Law
LaCrosse (Wis.) Normal
Los Angeles Osteopathic
Mass. Agricultural
Mass. Inst. Technology
Miami
Michigan
Minnesota
Montana
New York
New York Law
North Dakota
Northwestern
Oberlin
Ohio Northern
Ohio State
Ohio Wesleyan
Oregon Agricultural
Pennsylvania
Penn. State
Pittsburgh
Princeton
Radcliffe
Simmons
So. California
Springfield, Y. M. C. A. Coll.
Syracuse University
Temple
Union Theological
Utah
Valparaiso
Vassar
Washington
Wesleyan
Western Reserve
Williams
Wisconsin
Yale

The object of the INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY, established September 1905, is "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." All present or former students of colleges interested in Socialism are eligible to active membership in the Society. Non-collegians are eligible to auxiliary membership. The annual dues of the Society are $2, $5 (contributing membership), $25 or more (sustaining membership.) The dues of student members-at-large are $1 a year. Undergraduate Chapters are required to pay 25c. a year per member to the General Society. All members are entitled to receive The Intercollegiate Socialist. Friends may assist in the work of the Society by becoming dues-paying members, by sending contributions, by aiding in the organization and the strengthening of undergraduate and graduate Chapters, by obtaining subscriptions for The Intercollegiate Socialist, by patronizing advertisers, and in various other ways. The Society's Bi-monthly is 25c. a year, 10c. a copy, 15 copies for $1.

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

VOL. IV DECEMBER-JANUARY, 1915-16 No. 2

Seventh Annual Convention

Prospects are bright for an inspiring gathering at the Seventh Annual Convention of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society to be held in New York City, December 28-30. At the opening session on Tuesday afternoon at Miss Stokes' Studio, 90 Grove Street, a summary of the year's work by the Organizing Secretary will be followed by reports from the delegates and a discussion of Chapter problems.

On Tuesday evening, at 6:30, the delegates, the members of the Executive Committee and a few invited guests, will have supper at the Rand School, 140 E. 19th Street, and there will be informal speaking during the supper. Members of the New York Chapter and a few other guests will come to the Rand School after the supper for a reception.

The session on Wednesday morning and afternoon will be held at Columbia University by invitation of the Columbia and Barnard Chapters. The 10 A. M. session will be a continuation of the discussion of Chapter problems. After luncheon at the Commons, the Question Box session will take place, conducted by Miss Jessie W. Hughan. Questions should be submitted in writing beforehand and this session will prove, as it always has, one of the most valuable of the Convention.

"What is Internationalism?" will be the subject of the Convention Dinner to be held Wednesday evening, December 29th, at 6:30 o'clock, at Palm Garden, 150 E. 58th Street. The speakers will be Dr. John Haynes Holmes and Wm. English Walling, together with at least two others of varying points of view, whose names will be announced later. The Thursday morning session at Miss Stokes' Studio will be devoted to a discussion of the problems of the Alumni Chapters.

Another Milestone

With this issue our magazine is marking a new milestone—the first supplement, which is published herewith by the Research Committee. The valuable pamphlet on "Who Gets America's Wealth?" which Wm. English Walling has so generously prepared will, it is expected, be followed by others on "Collectivism in the United States," "Co-operation," and kindred subjects. Who shall say then that we are not compeers of *The New Statesman, The New Review, The New Republic,* and all the other newspapers that are trying to make a new world out of our round earth?

Get New Members

The I. S. S. is making a special effort this year to double its membership. How many members are you, Mr. Reader, going to bring into the fold? You will find conditions of membership on page 2. Help us to celebrate the coming into our teens by becoming a committee of one to augment our numbers. What are their names?

A Practical Suggestion

By John Spargo

Following the admirable addresses by Mrs. Kelley, Mrs. Frank, Miss Poyntz and Dr. Rubinow at the I. S. S. Conference at Hampton Falls, Miss

Ovington asked what Socialist members of the I. S. S. could do to bring the subject of unemployment before the Socialist Party in such a manner as to insure definite and well considered action by the party.

Unfortunately, the exigencies of the programme at the close of the Conference precluded the possibility of any adequate reply to what was, perhaps, the most important question raised during the entire Conference.

The suggestion was made by Miss Ovington that some representation might be made to the Socialist Party by those present—a suggestion to which Mr. Stokes sufficiently replied. The I. S. S. would, I believe, seriously impair its usefulness, and find itself embarked upon a perilous path, if it should begin to pass resolutions advising the Socialist Party (or any other party) upon questions of policy, or memorializing it upon any subject whatever.

But the Socialist members of the I. S. S. can, nevertheless, do much to bring about the desired change in Socialist policy. Our great trouble is that the literature of this and other subjects is similarly neglected, and the reports of investigations, researches and experiments are quite inaccessible to the average party member. They are prepared by specialists for specialists. Much of the literature is expensive or otherwise difficult to obtain. Most of it is difficult reading.

What we need more than anything else is the constant popularization of the mass of this material in the form of articles of reasonable length contributed to the Socialist press. If every Socialist member of the I. S. S. who, for professional or personal reasons, specializes in the subject of uemployment and remedial legislation therefor, would grasp the opportunity here indicated and from time to time contribute such articles as I have suggested, the rank and file of the party would soon be educated to the importance of the question, and the party itself would inevitably adopt a satisfactory policy in connection therewith.

In such articles statistics would be interpreted and vitalized; the wrong methods of dealing with the question would be pointed out, together with the reasons why they are wrong. In a little while, the unsatisfactory generalizations which now characterize all Socialist writing and speaking on the subject would give place to efficient and scientific treatment.

Incidentally, this work would be a material contribution to the solution of another problem of the Socialist movement—the unsatisfactory nature of the American Socialist press.

Such articles as I have suggested might well be sent to a selected group, or "circuit" of Socialist papers, through the central office of the I. S. S. They would inevitably be copied by nearly all the other Socialist papers, so that the writer of an article would have the satisfaction of knowing that he was addressing, not the National Committee of the party, or even a national convention of the party, but the entire party membership.

I need hardly point out that the work suggested is by no means restricted to the subject of unemployment. There are very many subjects which need thus be scientifically and intensively exploited if the American Socialist movement is ever to be practically efficient. We need, badly, such treatment of Cooperation, Taxation, and many other subjects.

Is not this an answer to the cry so often heard from the graduate members of the I. S. S.—"What can I do?"

The New Collectivism in Germany

By Traugott Böhme

When Sir Edward Grey replied, on February 10, 1915, to the American note in regard to the seizure and detention of American food-cargoes, he argued that the British plan of starving out Germany was justified, because, he said, in Germany "the distinction between the civil population and the armed forces" had disappeared in such a way that there was "no clear distinction between those whom the Government is responsible for feeding and those whom it is not." However futile such an argument may be in its legal aspect, there is no doubt a great deal of truth in it. Dr. Edmund Fischer, Socialist member of the Reichstag, has recently published an estimate that at present no less than 37 millions, or about 55 per cent of the total population of Germany, receive their means of living, directly or indirectly, from the state and, therefore, are outside the capitalistic system. The income of this group is being determined not by the law of demand and supply, but by considerations of the military efficiency and the general welfare of the state community. This situation was brought about, to be sure, for the most part by purely militaristic measures which will disappear automatically at the conclusion of peace.

But there is another group of war-created institutions which have their root, not in arbitrary decisions of military commanders, but in popular tendencies, that had vitally influenced the nation's life long before the war. The gravity of the war situation has only served to strengthen and quicken their development, and there is every prospect that these emergency measures will remain an integral part of Germany's public life in times of peace.

It is well known that the socialization of national life had reached a higher degree in Germany than in any other country, except Australia and New-Zealand; witness the state railways, the state insurance of labor, the state-owned coal and potash mines, the economic enterprises of the cities, the irresistible progress in state control of private monopolies and all the other fields of constructive public activities which have been so excellently described in William Harbutt Dawson's books on "Social Insurance in Germany" and "Municipal Life and Government in Germany." For many years the Socialist deputies in the city councils had urged upon the communities to participate in the production and distributon of victuals to such an extent as to influence the prices for the benefit of the inhabitants, and it had become an unquestioned general conviction that the provision of foodstuffs belonged to the regular duties of every respectable city administration.

Very soon after the outbreak of the war the question of food supplies became as vital for the nation's security as the military situation. Not a single food cargo from the United States has reached Germany since August 1, 1914. According to the most cautious statistics Germany had to import 20 per cent of her foodstuffs for human consumption from abroad, but furthermore, Germany could not hope to maintain its own output of meat and dairy products on the old level, since 20 per cent of her supply of fodder were cut off by England's interference with non-contraband trade. At first, the measures of the government seemed to be incommensurate with the magnitude of the danger. In October, 1914, maximum prices were fixed for rye, wheat and bran, but flour, bread and fodder were left to the speculators. This half-way measure helped nobody but the big grain dealers and flour-mill interests, while the farmers suffered because they had to pay excessive prices to the speculators for cattle

feed. Public agitation for a more effective food policy gained daily in strength. The farmers' organizations as well as the Socialist party and the labor unions were united in two principal demands: 1) Maximum prices for all kinds of grain, flour, bread and fodder; 2) Confiscation and distribution of all supplies by the state. The government seemed to dislike the idea of seriously hurting business interests, but finally had to yield to the pressing need of the hour. On January 15th, 1915, Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg held a special conference with representatives of the trade unions. Carl Legien reports that nearly all their proposals were embodied ten days later in the now famous proclamation of the Bundesrat (Federal Council) which marked the beginning of the state monopoly on foodstuffs. Later modifications of this original issue have not affected the two main principles stated above. The Central Corporation in Berlin, called *Zentraleinkaufsgesellschaft für das Reich,* acts mainly as wholesale purchasing committee and as general supervisor of price regulations, leaving the details of distributing methods entirely to local authorities. The elasticity of the plan is one of its chief characteristics. Besides the breadstuffs, other articles of food, which were menaced by England's trade policy, have been put under federal control, such as potatoes, meat, milk, dairy products, eggs and, quite recently, fats and oils. The newly established *Preisprüfungsstelle für das Reich* (Federal Price Examining Board) to which several Socialists have been appointed, opens a still wider field for collective interference with private business enterprise.

On the whole, the new federal corporations have regulated the distribution of the necessaries of life with marked success, but they have barely touched the more important side of cooperative enterprise: the organization of production. National spirit does not wait for governmental leadership to give expression to its instincts for cooperative action. It has been shown how the agitation of farmers' and workers' unions and of the Socialist party prevailed upon the government to give up its reluctance to adopt drastic collective schemes. But the most powerful agencies of the new collective impulses have been the large cities. Most of them had stored up all kinds of provisions and laid down rules for their rational distribution long before the Bundesrat told them to do so.

In the meantime many progressive city administrations have gone one step further. From merely distributive collectivism they have entered, with greater eagerness than before the war, on productive activities of their own. Municipal farming enterprises on various lines indicate how collectivist instincts will lead to new national organizations of a productive character. Here again the government will have to systematize, generalize and legalize what has been prepared and developed by the productive forces of the nation itself.

Collectivist efforts have not been restricted only to the question of food supplies. The newly discovered process of producing saltpeter in large quantities from the nitrogen of the air was turned into a state monopoly by recent action of the Reichstag; this not only safeguards Germany's supply of high explosives for the war, but will also make her vast chemical industries independent of the Chilean market, which hitherto held almost a world monopoly in nitrate. War conditions gave the government also the long desired opportunity for bringing the most powerful private trust—the Rhenish Westphalian Coal Syndicate—partly under state control. A law was passed which forced the syndicate to admit the state-owned coal mines as members, and which guaranteed in every respect ample consideration for public interests, especially in the matter of price regulations. The influence of the Prussian fiscal mines in the management of the coal syndicate is credited

with the remarkable fact that the coal prices have been advanced only 25 cents per ton.

The war would have jeopardized millions of dollars of workingmen's savings invested in the various branches of social insurance, had not the government readily adopted special measures for safeguarding this important collectivist enterprise. New regulations were given out, so that all men called to the colors would be exempt from paying their premiums without losing their claims on the state insurance. This measure not only referred to men serving in the army, but also to non-combatants engaged in some public function at home. Government responsibility for the families of war victims has been considerably extended. Illegitimate and adopted children who have lost their supporters in the war are now taken care of by the state.

Care for the unemployed has brought about a most surprising co-operation between the state, the municipal authorities and the trade unions. Two hundred million marks were appropriated in the imperial budget mainly for the purpose of reimbursing cities for their expenditures in behalf of unemployed workmen. Berlin pays to every unemployed a fee which amounts to 50 per cent of the sum given to him by his labor unions. This simple measure, much imitated by other German cities, illustrates the spirit of mutual confidence.

The greatest surprise for the labor unions, however, has been the attitude of the military authorities. Many of the labor leaders had expected that the labor unions would be dissolved at the outbreak of the war. But instead of suppression, they found a better understanding for their needs among military authorities than they had generally met among civilian officialdom. In placing big armament orders, the military officials strictly insisted on satisfactory wages and labor conditions, usually on the basis of the collective labor contracts, which had been, through mutual agreements between employers' and labor organizations, in force before the war. Without this strong official support the results of decades of labor struggles would have come to naught. Every issue of the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* reports new cases in which the interests of the working classes were safeguarded or furthered by the intervention of military authorities. The most conspicuous of such labor victories in war-time was the new collective wage contract in the leather industries, which was agreed upon between the representatives of labor and employers' interests under active cooperation of the war ministry on January 26, 1915, in the merchants' court house at Berlin. This contract brings a 15 per cent increase in wages, in addition to an extra war bonus of 20 per cent, and is binding on both parties throughout the empire for three years.

The attitude of the military authorities is only an indication of the new place which the labor unions have reached in the nation's life. They have at last come to their own. The government has given assurances in the Reichstag that, henceforth, they will not be considered any longer as "political societies"—this means they will be no longer subjected to petty police supervision. They are now universally recognized as legitimate organs of the nation itself. The government consults their representatives on all important measures and accepts their advice as expert verdicts. Socialist members have been appointed for service in several of the newly created boards for collective administration of the nation's economic resources.

The old barrier of distrust between government and labor seems to be broken down, and the general confidence in the progress of socialization is well ex-

pressed in the words of Gertrude David: "Whatever the political results of the war may be, there can be no doubt that in the field of economics the system of socialized cooperation has already proven its practical superiority over the system of free economic competition."

*The information contained in this article is mainly based on the excellent fortnightly review *"Socialistische Monatshefte"* (Berlin). Other periodicals consulted were *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv*, vol. IX; *Annalen für sociale Politik und Gesetzgebung*, vol. IX; *Soziale Praxis*, vol. XXIV. The daily paper *Magdeburgische Zeitung* was also at hand up to Oct. 15, 1915.

War Collectivism in England

By Caro Lloyd

At the outbreak of war all countries with "an instinctive collectivism" turned to the state. The necessity to extend the already socialized industry of fighting led to invasions of private industry. Within two weeks the English State declared its supremacy by forming one emergency committee after another, on food and prices, on housing, on farming, on the cotton trade. "The war," said *The New Statesman*, "has brought collectivism upon us like a flood." It led England to do at a stroke what would ordinarily have taken a century of debate, namely, to operate the railways. This was done under the Regulation of the Forces Act of 1871, by placing a government committee of general managers in control. There was practically no friction, because for some time previous, unknown to most citizens, a joint committee of railway managers had been working out the details of a national system. The Act provides for compensation to the owners for loss during government control, and is considered very favorable to them. The railways are now managed not for profit, but for maximum public service.

For a century, England has been investigating the sugar industry, but the crisis brought summary action. By November it had bought £20,000,000 worth and had entire control of the market. Its administration, however, has been severely criticised for its exploitation of the people.

The need for war equipment has caused an even more widespread near-collectivism. On March 10, the new Minister of Munitions, Lloyd George, asked the Commons for the Defense of the Realms Act Amendment, No. 2, whose provisions are said to be the most drastic ever put to any House of Commons. It asked for power to take charge of any plants, workshops, wealth, organization, labor, which could be fitted to the munitions business. This was granted after a short debate. "What would ordinarily imply a social revolution," said the *Saturday Review*, "was calmly accepted by the House of Commons as a practical detail in the conduct of the war." The aim of the bill, made law in July, was to secure maximum output by the workers and to curb the greed of private manufacturers, but an analysis shows the excess of sacrifices demanded from the workers. They are forced to surrender the advantages gained by generations of struggle, to suspend trade union rules, and the right to strike, while the employers are secured by law in all normal profits with an extra 20 per cent war profit. Immediately upon its enforcement, 200,000 miners who came under its rules defied it by striking, and won a 10 per cent increase. The whole of the engineering industry, which is doing anything for war material, is now state-controlled, and the government has built about 27 new munition factories in which there is no question of profits. But the Act is causing such friction that *The New Statesman* describes the bitterness of anti-capitalist feeling in the

labor world as unequaled in England's history.

Again and again since the war began has the government been forced toward collective control by the greed of private owners. Six months after the outbreak, coal became so dear that the government investigated. Although there was no increase in the cost of getting or of moving it, the price rose 70 per cent, even 100 per cent, and it became clear that private owners were amassing fortunes. In London they were charging 9s. a ton increase, while the cooperators, serving nearly half a million families, charged only 3s. increase. This contrast is one of many which have illumined to the people the superiority of co-operative over individualistic industry. The extent of collectivism resulting from the coal situation was a maximum price law.

In the matter of food and liquor, the government's action has not been more drastic. The liquor problem was met at first by consideration of state-purchase and prohibition, then of heavy duties and taxes, but even this raised such a cry that it was abandoned and a mild regulation of times of sale was enacted.

In spite of four years' agitation for state granaries for war time, the conflict found England dependent upon import. It normally produces about one-fifth of its wheat, about one-third its butter, cheese, meat; in milk and potatoes alone is it self-supporting. By April bread had risen in price 50 per cent. When war collectivism started, it was said that the most difficult avenue to socialize would be the export trade. But in March the government of India monopolized the entire export wheat trade, taking for one year from the grower "whatever wheat the government thinks fit, at prices which it will fix, shipping it in vessels which the government will provide, for sale in London on government account." In May the government requisitioned the entire meat supply from New Zealand and Australia for army use and to prevent speculative prices. In June Horace Plunkett and others were beseeching the administration to increase home production of foodstuff, but as yet, said *The New Statesman,* "no parks are surrendered to the plough, no game preserves abandoned." Although Germany is cultivating even the roadsides, England does not yet seem to have taken effective action on the food supply. Its expert committees appear too timid to create a precedent for interference with unused land.

The government's attempt to institute dye works proved premature, but it bought most of the crop of natural indigo; and it inaugurated a dye research laboratory. It also undertook state insurance against war damage. In the field of finance, it closed the Stock Exchange, prohibited new issues of securities, and endeavored to limit capitalists' profits in a way that would have astounded their grandfathers but was approved even by *The Times.* Most notable however has been its taxation of the income of the rich, of which over one-third has been taken.

In general, England has shown anew that her temperament and tactics are individualistic. Her collectivism has very timidly interfered with the individual proprietor. Her people are still under the spell of caste. In view of this her remarkable access of government activity seems all the more striking and also more significant, as a statesman has said, because her progress is so largely steered by precedent.

How much of this collectivist control is socialistic and how much autocratic and temporary is what we are all asking. But the world at large has seen industry in a new light as cooperative and collective. This cannot be undone. Socialists moreover have seen how evolutionary events take propaganda out of their hands and hurry this old world along. Amidst all the horrors, the marvellous growth of the state as agent of the common good alone gives light in a dark sky.

German State Socialism

By William English Walling

The leading political question for many years is destined to be "State Socialism." It has been brought to the foreground by the war in the following form: "Will America, England, and other countries be forced to imitate the 'State Socialism' of Germany in order to provide for national efficiency in the economic and military struggles of the future?" Frederick C. Howe, one of America's most eminent democrats, has furnished us a book on this subject which will probaly be the standard for several years. It does not cover the whole field, but it does cover a large part of it, and in a highly satisfactory manner, so that the volume will have to be read by every intelligent and well-informed radical.

Howe is not a partisan of Germany. But he is a partisan of State Socialism and he assumes that Germany is the one great embodiment of this policy in the world, not condescending even to mention the equally advanced and efficient State Socialism of Australia, built upon a purely democratic foundation. The *political* system of Germany is vigorously attacked as being absolutely undemocratic throughout; but her economic policy State Socialism is at the same time made out to be perfection. Thus he presents the case as if there is no practical or concrete connection whatever between the political institutions of Germany and her economic conditions.

The whole volume is directed against the economic individualism or "laissez-faire" of Great Britain and America. Individualism and not class rule, according to Howe and the State Socialists, is the enemy.

Howe devotes three chapters to a careful statement of the fundamentally and thoroughly anti-democratic character of German political institutions. In his fourth chapter he even takes a further step and handles the "economic foundations of class rule" in Germany. It is a country completely governed and controlled by Prussian landlords, or Junkers, except the cities, which are controlled by Big Business:

"Prussia, and, through Prussia, Germany, reflects the economic interests of the great estate owner or the Junker. He in effect IS the government . . . . And he uses his power to promote his own interests, which are mainly agrarian, to shift the taxes onto others, to maintain the army and the navy, : nd to resist all electoral reform" (p. 32).

"As a class, the Junker is opposed to education for the peasant; he is opposed to every evidence of liberty or democracy, and clings tenaciously to the divine right of the King and his own class to rule" (p. 43).

"The ruling class in the city is the business men. They control the elections and select men of their own class or viewpoint to the higher administrative positions. And the business men who rule are not the shopkeepers or the tradesmen; they are the men of large means, the real estate owners, and house owners. And just as the Junker rules Prussia in his own interest, so the business men mould the city to their own interest" (p. 47).

Then begins a series of most amazing contradictions. After stating that the Junkers and Big Business rule Germany, and in their own interests, Howe proceeds to state the direct opposite; namely, that they rule Germany in the interest of all classes and of the country as a whole. For instance he says of the cities: "No ruling class in the world seems to negative the idea of class control of politics as do the business men of the German cities, for they rule for the city rather than for themselves" (p. 48).

Space forbids quotations of the numerous other passages of the same char-

acter. Let us select for the purpose of illustration his handling of some of the leading topics, such as labor legislation and education.

Howe repeatedly refers to Germany's insurance of her workingmen and other similar legislation as a demonstration that Germany is "a democratically-minded country" in which there is "economic freedom" and "industrial and social equality." He even goes so far as to say that this and similar legislation is bringing about a "juster distribution of wealth," "a more generous distribution of the gains of civilization." Yet Howe himself says that the chief motive of such legislation has been to increase the physical health and efficiency of the workers because of the value of such a policy to the State. He also admits that the employers believe they have gained by this legislation. Why more scientific methods of exploiting labor when adopted by employers and the State, which Howe confesses is controlled by the employers in their own interests, should constitute a "juster distribution of wealth for the benefit of civilization" is not explained.

Howe himself has in several passages with perfect accuracy stated what the real economic policy of the German government is; namely, *"the co-ordination of the individual into a national machine"* in which *"the people have been indissolubly merged into the State."*

Indeed Germany has really not adopted the policy of State Socialism at all, but only *so much* of State Socialism as suits the interests and purposes of the ruling classes—the Junkers, and Big Business. As Howe himself says: "The dominant political class has not been opposed to State Socialism, so long as State Socialism did not interfere with its own privileges and property."

Yet, notwithstanding the very frequent lucid intervals that come to Howe, such as I have just quoted, he lapses back, on nearly every page, to his blind admiration of this German class state. Again and again he insists upon referring to municipal enterprises as "owned by the city," though he states in several passages that the cities are handed over, by virtue of the three class election system, into the hands of the richest two-thirds of the tax payers, who constitute from three to ten per cent of the population! If American cities were thus owned by Big Business, can we doubt that they, too, would go in for every manner of "municipal enterprise", that is, enterprise operated for themselves? Indeed, Howe naively recognizes this situation when he refers to the Big Business interests which control the cities and have entered into activities "in competition with themselves." Simply another case of interlocking directorates. The Big Business men in Germany have two attributes—their interests as owners of their private business and their interests as owners of the municipality.

And now take Howe's review of the German educational system. He says: "Universal education offers opportunities to even the poorest to advance, whether it be in the service of the state or in the fields of individual effort." Only a few pages further on he admits the overwhelming importance of governmental service in Germany (which occupies three million people), and says that all the higher positions require a very long and, of course, expensive education—which means that they are absolutely shut off from the common people. He might have added that the government pays for this kind of education about fifty times more per capita than it does for education of the common people. Indeed, it is the definite policy of the government to *prevent* the entrance of any considerable number of common people into the higher educational institutions.

"While the ministries of education and commerce seek to stimulate the children of those on the lowest levels to become skilled workers, the effort is also made to prevent too many from going into the

higher technical fields. . . ." (Monarchial Socialism in Germany, Elmer Roberts, p. 57.)

There are numerous other phases of German education with which Howe must undoubtedly be familiar, but as regards which he is strangely reticent. He must know that the schools of the country districts of Prussia are among the worst in any European country—there being often more than one hundred pupils to a single teacher. He admits that the basis of the common schools is obedience and discipline, and not the training of each child to its maximum capacities for development. He says: "Elementary, secondary and technical education partakes of the same caste system, the same state control. *The individual child is educated for the station in life to which he is born.* Schools are classified accordingly. The choice once made is in the majority of instances irrevocable" (p. 333). (Italics mine.)

"The child is moulded by the state, to the state's idea of what is best for the state, and only incidentally what is best for the child. There is uniformity rather than variety, and in consequence that initiative so characteristic of America is almost wholly lacking in the average child.

"Prussia has ironed out personal individuality by the educational system described. And this is a terrible loss, as is any system that fails to awaken and keep alive the spontaneity and resourcefulness of the people" (p. 334).

Howe even goes farther and points out the perversion and stifling of true science in the higher educational institutions of the country.

"Caste rules in education. This is possibly the most serious criticism that can be made against the educational system of Germany. It affects the universities in which conformity is the open door to advancement. This destroys criticism, it censors the intellectuals, it identifies the entire scientific world with the state, and the state as interpreted by the ruling caste" (pp. 332-333).

Yet, after all this, he has "unbounded" respect for the German educational system.

If a further illustration were needed, it may be found in the most important of all Germany's collectivist enterprises—more important than all the rest put together; namely, the government railroads. Howe wants us to believe that Germany has produced a certain equality in the business world. He says: "Germany protects *industrial and social equality,* while America protects political and personal equality. Her freedom is in the economic, ours in the politcal field" (p. 85). (Italics mine.) And he uses the railroads as a special illustration, claiming that there is "no favoritism" in their operation. Yet Howe himself—in this instance—supplies sufficient material to entirely refute his own statements. The German railways have been nationalized and are operated purely for the purposes of the ruling class and their government. He admits (on page 93) that the state governments secure thirty-five or fifty per cent of their revenues in this way, though he fails to call our attention to the extremely important fact that this makes these governments largely independent of miserable similacrums of parliaments with which Germany is provided. [That they are mere similacrums Howe carefully states in his introductory chapters.] He also admits that the land-owning and capitalist classes favor nationalization because it furnishes a governmental income and inheritance taxes which they would otherwise be forced to pay. He admits further that the business men complain that the railways are not used sufficiently for industry, but are very largely operated in order to build up profits for the state.

"Property, business and industry," Howe tells us, "are regulated in the public's interest." How can this be when he says that the nation is governed

by the Junkers and the cities by Big Business, so that in Berlin, for example, one "first-class vote has the same voice in the city government as three hundred and seventy-five third-class votes?

Howe calls his book "Socialized Germany." "Governmentalized Germany" would be a far more accurate title, but not satisfactory. "Class-organized" is the only phrase that scientifically describes the system. The masses are scientifically organized for a two-fold purpose—military efficiency and industrial efficiency. The ruling classes are practically not regimental at all; far from serving the state, they make the state serve them—as Howe confesses when he states that the Junkers have preserved the larger part of the privileges of Eighteenth Century feudalism.

Indeed, Howe's title is almost a complete inversion of the truth. Would it not have been somewhat nearer to the reality to have described the present system as "Anti-Social Germany"? Has the scientifically organized government of that country neglected any detail by which the common welfare could be sacrificed in the interest of the ruling classes? Is not each and every branch of this so-called State Socialism aimed *exclusively* at this object?

The Extent of Collective Ownership and Democratic Management Under Socialism

By Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan,
Author of "American Socialism of the Present Day," etc.

Now that the intelligent public is mastering the idea that Socialism is not Communism, but deals with the public ownership of capital rather than of consumers' goods, a new question has taken the place of the old, "Will Socialism compel me to share my house and dining-table with my neighbor?" The new question is, "Will Socialism take away my little shop, my little farm, my sewing-machine, my wheelbarrow?"

Socialists are still extant who silence the inquirer with statements that the wheelbarrow is inferior as a means of transport to the motor truck, that the family clothes can be made more efficiently in the factory than by the emancipated mother, and that the little shop and farm are bound to be swallowed up by the corporations before Socialism comes in. The modern Marxian, however, gives comfort that is less cold. The Socialist demand, he explains, is not for the socialization of all industry, but merely of the "social" tools of production. Which of the answers is the really scientific one, and just how far in Collectivism will the ownership of the "social" tools of production carry us?

For many years Marxians considered it Utopian to predict any definite details as to the co-operative commonwealth. Where Marx had halted, at the broad prophecy of the downfall of capitalism and the seizure of industry by the proletariat, they also halted, leaving to the non-Marxians the congenial task of filling in the outlines. We know how this task was accomplished, and have hardly yet finished clearing away the visions of bureaucracy, free love and "dead level" that long meant Socialism to the man in the street.

With this new work has come a new perception of Utopian and of scientific Socialism. The latter is not synonymous with "deduced from Marx" and the former with "not deduced from Marx"; but scientific Socialism now

means to us those conclusions which are drawn from the economic tendencies of the time; Utopian, those which are based upon mere plans or preferences. For example, the expectation that the future organization of industry will be based on the trust is scientific, if arising from a present economic tendency. The expectation of literal equality is Utopian, if founded merely on the preference of certain Socialists for such equality.

It is scientifically legitimate for us to predict, never precisely, but each year with greater precision as the time draws near, the bounds of collective ownership and democratic management under Socialism. The "practical man" demands an answer, and it is our business to give it as nearly as we can, for, however great our faith in the inevitability of the revolution, we are confident also of its desirability for mankind as a whole.

According to the Marxian philosophy, the supreme contradiction in bourgeois society is that capital, used socially by one set of persons, the proletariat, is owned privately by another set of persons, the capitalists, with the necessary consequence of exploitation of the former by the latter. Private ownership of capital, in the usual economic sense of wealth used in the production of more wealth, does not enter into this contradiction at all; but merely private ownership of capital that is socially used by another set of persons than the owners, with the result of exploitation. The removal of the contradiction by Socialism will imply, therefore, the collective ownership of only this special type of capital. It will include neither that capital socially owned and operated by workmen's co-operatives, nor that capital privately owned and operated by some solitary craftsman or farmer.

When we ask what proportion of capital will come under the "social" category, we leave deduction from Marx for induction from the facts of industry. Here is the parting of the ways. Certain Socialists decline to attempt definiteness through fear of Utopianism. Others refuse to differ in their induction from Marx himself, and, keeping as nearly as possible to his interpretation of the tendencies of 1848, they predict the absolute disappearance of the craftsman and yeoman farmer previous to the Socialist regime. To them it is futile to invite the support of these doomed classes, and false to promise any lease of life to those who may chance to survive to the days of the commonwealth.

Can we give any more satisfactory answer than these to the question of the "practical man"? It is true, indeed, that we cannot lay down certain rules for the future. Economics is not an exact science, and the tendencies of to-day may be deflected to-morrow. A Socialism conceived of in 1915 as miraculously completed by the following year would differ materially from the corresponding vision conceived in 1905 or 1925 and still more from the actual outlines of such a society as slowly developed through years of friction. It would be strange, however, if our predictions could not be more exact and trustworthy than those of 1860. We cannot foretell the precise nature of the sea to which our economic currents are sweeping us, but it behooves us to take soundings each day with a nearer approach to the truth.

The tendencies described in the Communist Manifesto have already developed to such a point that we have certain industries, — railroads, telephones, telegraphs and wireless, trolleys, water, electric and gas lighting,— which are acknowledged by all as thoroughly social. With few exceptions these departments are owned chiefly

by absentee stockholders, while the labor, including superintendence, is performed by employes. All of these depend upon public franchise, are largely subject to regulation, and have become so involved with local, state or national government that only the genuine conservative denies their ripeness in 1915 for collective ownership.

A second set of industries includes mines, oil-wells, and other businesses depending upon special privileges in land. They are largely conducted by corporations and almost as completely socialized as the transportation system. Not only Socialists but most radicals believe the collective ownership of these to be but a few years away. The larger trusts also clearly belong in this group, as depending, if more indirectly, upon privilege of one sort or another. We may be sure that any of these that have become of sufficient social importance to require investigation or regulation will be taken over in the early stages of Socialism.

The smaller trusts, the mass of large industry as yet outside the trusts, and the multitude of small concerns,—will all these come eventually under collective ownership? The matter simplifies itself. Except in the very monstrosity of the larger trusts which provoke dissolution by society, the march of concentration shows as yet no sign of a halt. As fast as one set of industries is taken out of private hands, we may count on another's being trustified. There can be little doubt that by the time Socialism attains a working majority in this country, the great bulk of business, the "principal industries," will be ready for collective ownership.

The character of this collective ownership and democratic management is outside of the present discussion. While exact prophecy is again impossible, we may be reasonably certain that workmen's co-operatives will increase in number and importance, and that the present tendency toward industrial organization will be intensified under Socialist conditions. The proportion of industrial to governmental organization and the precise relationships likely to exist between the two are yet to be determined. Even in governmental ownership, however, there is room for a wide variety. We may expect the size and ramifications of the specific industry to settle whether it is to be owned by the federal, state, or municipal government, and the Socialist policy of local autonomy is likely to work against any great uniformity of organization.

It is to this point only, the socialization of the principal industries, that the Socialist platform takes us; farther than this economic tendency does not yet point the way and Socialism can make no assured statement. While to Marx and his first followers the total disappearance of the craftsman and peasant farmer was a mere matter of time, we cannot be so positive. A complexity of economic currents confronts us, unknown to Marx, and the advance of democracy itself is bringing forces into play that may defer indefinitely the period of complete socialization.

In considering the fate of the smaller farms and industrial establishments, we can no longer be strictly scientific in the sense of predicting the course of economic tendency. It is legitimate, however, to point out the probable policy of a victorious proletariat, in complete control of government and the larger industrial forces, and pledged to abolish the exploitation of labor. The Socialist ethical doctrine of the right of the workers, as a whole, to the whole product of labor is already to be traced in a series of drastic immediate demands, aiming at the lessening of private profits and the bettering of labor conditions and rewards. An early enactment of a Socialist majority will doubtless secure through collective enterprise the right of

every adult to labor at a standard wage; and it will be natural by direct and indirect methods to raise this wage until it approximates the full product of each grade of labor.

Conceiving this process as complete, the problem of the small business solves itself. Broadly speaking, the private employer, whether farmer or manufacturer, will be compelled by labor legislation on the one hand and the competition of collective enterprise on the other, to pay each worker the value of his labor. His own profit in the sense of exploitation tends to disappear; for, though as an independent craftsman he continues to receive his own entire product, he gains little from his employes except the advantage of cooperation, or possibly an opportunity not furnished by any collective industry available to him of exercising his own productive skill as superintendent. Under this no-profit regime, private establishments of any size will doubtless be comparatively rare. The prohibition of private enterprise in any field, however, will be contrary to Socialist principles, unless, as at present, where necessary to public safety, and there will probably be many survivals. We can conceive, for example, of a large private school operated under the Socialist commonwealth, as now, for those whose peculiar demands are not met by the generally more efficient public schools. Forced by government competition and legislation to pay his teachers the standard rate, the principal may yet find it greatly to his advantage to maintain an enterprise which enables him to utilize, in cooperation with other workers, some special ability in catering to unusual desires which would be useless to a teacher working alone.

Granting the Social Revolution, we may expect the surviving private enterprise, where not confined to the single craftsman or farmer, to be the type just described.

To the inquirer after the future of private industry, therefore, we are able to state with scientific certainty only the approximate extent of collective ownership and democratic management under Socialism. As to the residue of small businesses, we must be frankly indefinite in prescribing their fate at the hands of economic forces. Substituting for economic forces, however, the probable policy of the victorious workers, we are safe in predicting that many small establishments may be allowed to survive capitalism without danger to the Socialist aim of abolishing once for all the exploitation of labor.

Ten Years of I. S. S. Progress

By Harry W. Laidler

In the Spring of 1905, following the presidential election which swelled the Socialist vote to 400,000, Upton Sinclair secured the signatures of a number of publicists, including Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Jack London, Oscar Lovell Triggs, B. O. Flower, Clarence Darrow, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Wm. English Walling and Leonard D. Abbott, to the following call:

In the opinion of the undersigned the recent remarkable increase in the Socialist vote in America should serve as an indication to the educated men and women in the country, that Socialism is a thing concerning which it is no longer wise to be indifferent.

The undersigned, regarding its aims and fundamental principles with sympathy, and believing that in them will ultimately be found the remedy for many far-reaching economic evils, propose organizing an association, to be known as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, for the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in Socialism

among college men, graduate and undergraduate, through the formation of study clubs in the colleges and universities, and the encouraging of all legitimate endeavors to awaken an interest in Socialism among the educated men and women of the country.

This mild sounding call was received in many quarters with consternation. Harper's Weekly meted out its condemnation in no uncertain terms, especially upbraiding Thomas Wentworth Higginson, "the grand old man of Harvard," for endeavoring "to imbue the minds of the rising generation with Socialistic teachings." Mr. Higginson replied by stating that "those who seriously criticise the object of the Society—that of thoughtfully studying the Socialistic tendencies of the times and the underlying philosophy of Socialism—must be classed with those mediæval grammarians who wrote of an adversary, 'May God confound thee for thy theory of irregular verbs.'"

It was not until the fall of 1905 that the I. S. S. formally started on its career. On September 12, shortly after the beginning of the college year, some one hundred collegians and others gathered in the rather dingy room of Peck's Restaurant, 140 Fulton St., N. Y. City, and in the fag end of the hot afternoon, after a somewhat chaotic session, with Mr. Sinclair as chief spokesman, an organization was hastily formed. Jack London was elected president, Upton Sinclair, 1st vice-president, J. G. Phelps Stokes, 2nd vice-president, Owen R. Lovejoy, treasurer, Miss M. R. Holbrook, secretary, and Morris Hillquit, Robert Hunter, Geo. H. Strobell, Mrs. Darwin J. Meserole, Geo. Willis Cooke, and Harry W. Laidler additional members of the Executive Committee.

The Society had for some time a very tenuous existence. George H. Strobell conducted the correspondence for a while until the strain became too great and he passed the burden on to Mr. Sinclair. Sinclair was then busy on the Jungle and the business of tieing up I. S. S. packages, corresponding with inquiring students, etc., often kept him occupied until the wee hours of the morning.

"The Confessions of a Drone," by Joseph Medill Patterson; "What Life Means to Me," by London and Sinclair, and "Political Decay," by Prof. Ross, were the chief literary gems distributed in the beginning year of the Society's work.

The most interesting of the efforts of 1906 was the lecture trip of Jack London. London started on his tour across the continent after delivering an address on "Revolution" at the University of California, which shocked the serenity of the student life in that Pacific Coast university.

On arriving in New York he spoke in the Grand Central Palace, before a huge gathering, under the Society's auspices, and made a strong impression.

"In white flannel shirt, rolling flannel collar, white flowing silk tie, black cheviot coat and well worn patent leather pumps," he next made his appearance at conservative Yale. He was scheduled to speak in Woolsey Hall, the largest of the University's auditoriums, under the auspices of the Yale Debating Union. His subject was "The Coming Crisis," and to the surprise of many who knew him only as one of the foremost literary men of the country, he confined his remarks to the coming industrial revolution which, he contended, was fast approaching.

"In the United States," he declared, "there are one million men who begin their letters, 'Dear Comrade' and sign them, 'Yours for the Revolution.' In all countries the comrades are gathering—now seven millions strong—who will fight with all their might for the conquest of the world and the complete overthrow of existing society."

"The spectacle of an avowed Socialist, one of the most conspicuous in the country," declared the New Haven Register, "standing on the platform of Woolsey Hall

and boldly advocating his doctrines of Revolution, was a sight for gods and men."

The talk virtually closed Woolsey Hall for nearly ten years to students' meetings, the lecture of Dr. Anna Shaw last year being the first to be held under the auspices of an undergraduate organization since the famous London shock.

A number of other memories crowd upon me of these early days of the Society's existence. I remember how, in December, 1905, at Wesleyan, a few of us students caused a furore in the quiet scholastic atmosphere of the New England college by actually organizing a Wesleyan Chapter of the I. S. S. This was the first study chapter in the country, with the possible exception of that in Columbia, formed by Wm. Feigenbaum. "How dreadful," observed some of the good professors, "that Wesleyan should take the lead in such a pernicious enterprise!"

In May, 1907, came the re-organization of the Committee and the election of Mr. Stokes as president and of Mr. Ghent as secretary. Added also to the Committee were Miss Stokes, Paul Kennaday, Elizabeth Butler, Elizabeth Dutcher, Jessie Hughan, Leroy Scott, and later on Miss Sanford, Ernest Poole, Robert Bruere and others.

Then followed our years of parasitism on the Rand School at 112 E. 19th St., where Miss Laddon began her excellent work in behalf of the Society.

We finally commenced our hunt for an organizer, and hit upon Fred. Merrick. Organizer Merrick soon made his first trip to Pennsylvania and New Jersey. At Princeton his advent gave rise to one of the famous Princeton's "pee-rades." Merrick, after arrival, found himself at the head of a huge mob of Princeton students, who raised aloft the red flag, sung the Marseillaise, burned bon-fires and made the hills echo with the Princeton yell in honor of the "wild agitator." During the address that followed Merrick was continuously bombarded through the windows with firecrackers and sky rockets. He was "game," however, and the event had its propaganda value.

I remember with what trepidation the Society undertook its first dinner in Peck's Restaurant. Secretary Ghent guessed that the dinner might attract forty or so, and nearly two hundred were at wits' ends trying to find accommodations. The *New York Sun*, thus, in part, described this event:

"From what went on after the dinner was stowed away, it was gathered that it was the aim of the society to swat wage slavery with diplomas or smother it with degrees or something."

"Among those who checked their muckrakes early in the evening at the coat room," it added, "was Ray Stannard Baker. It had been hoped that Upton Sinclair, who is first vice-president of the society, would be present, to tell about the millionaire who has a solid gold fountain studded with diamond tiaras in his private park where grows a grove of solid mahogany and rosewood trees, imported (roots and all) from their tropical homes and fertilized with terrapin and the fricasseed wings of yearling humming birds. But Mr. Sinclair was unable to appear . . . . ."

The New York Chapter was formed that night, and after a number of vicissitudes, started on its successful career.

Organizer Merrick was weened away from the society by the city editorship of the *Call*, and George R. Kirkpatrick did notable work for two years, until 1910, when the present organizing secretary was appointed.

The next step which the Society took with fear and trembling was the annual convention held in the latter part of 1909. Until a few days prior to the meeting, it seemed likely to attract less than a corporal's guard. It turned out, however, a marked success. The establishment of the wee bulletin, the obtaining of offices all our own, the employment of an executive secretary, the conducting of our first Carnegie Hall meeting, at which the first Socialist congressman held forth after his election; the scheduling of John Spargo to the

New England colleges—the first extensive trip of any speaker under our auspices—the birth of our Quarterly; the establishment of the Research Department, the conducting of a Labor Day Conference, the increase of our undergraduate Chapters to between 60 and 70 and our alumni Chapters to more than a dozen, have all been landmarks in the evolution of the influence of the Society.

Last summer we endeavored to form a loose international federation. An international intercollegiate conference was first scheduled for Vienna, then changed to Paris, and finally, when the war cloud burst, was indefinitely postponed.

During the period of the Society's history, there have been marked changes in the attitude of educated men and women toward Socialism. To repeat the statement made in the April-May issue of the Intercollegiate Socialist:

"In 1905 scarcely a group for the study of Socialism could be found in any institution of higher learning. The number of college professors devoting any considerable time to this subject might have been counted on the fingers of one hand. Public or class room lectures on Socialism by outside speakers were well-nigh unheard of, while addresses along this line in college chapels were too horrifying even to contemplate.

"Furthermore, literature on this subject was scant, for, with the exception of Morris Hillquit's "History of Socialism in the United States," practically no book, written by an American Socialist and bearing directly on Socialism, had as yet appeared in the lists of non-Socialist publishers—unless we consider such keen analyses of present conditions as were contained in the "Cost of Competition," "Poverty" and "Our Benevolent Feudalism."

"Ten years have wrought marked changes. Over three score of colleges now contain I. S. S. Chapters; hundreds of lectures on this subject are given every season before tens of thousands of collegians; scores of courses in Socialism are contained in college curricula, while publishers vie with one another to obtain for their lists standard books on Socialism."

When the I. S. S. began its work it was most difficult for its lecturers to get officially before economics classes and college bodies. During the travels last season of the organizing secretary alone, nearly 80 economics, sociology, logic, English and other classes were opened for lectures on Socialism, while addresses were given before over a dozen entire college bodies.

The Society believes that most of this change has been due to the evolution of industry and the growth of the Socialist movement. In that change, however, the I. S. S. has also played its part.

The Society has been successful in attaining results, not because of the energy of one person or a small group of persons, but because of the splendid cooperation of many groups. We have indeed been blessed with a loyal staff of helpers, faithful Executive Committees, an able and devoted group of speakers and writers, an energetic corps of student workers and college instructors and a host of ardent friends.

What enthusiastic support from the many hundreds of undergraduates who, in their respective colleges, have been doing the real work, without which the society would have been but a paper organization! It has been the Jimmy Higginses at work in colleges all over the country who have proved the greatest factors in the progress of the Society. Trachtenberg, Rogers, Murphy, Bridgeman, Dunn and others at Yale have been the real factors who have built up the I. S. S. organization there from a mere handful to one of the most significant and thought-compelling societies on the campus.

Lippmann, Macgowan, Henderson, Moderwell, Eliot, Chubb and others at Harvard; Kenneday, Egloff, Gerber at Cornell; Bishop and Marckwardt at Michigan; men like Hinkle at Williams; Seelye, McCorkle and Williams at Union Theologue; Herbert and Humphreys at Springfield Y. M. C. A.; Cheyney and Hourwich at U. of P.; the Misses Kirchwey, Parker, Whitney, Folks at Barnard, Radcliffe and Vassar respectively; Zier-

ing at Valparaiso; Nelson and Rickle at Washington; Feigenbaum, Trimble, Bobbe, Douglas, Wellman in Columbia; Glass and Wittenberg in New York Law; Tead of the New England Committee, are but a few of those who have borne the real brunt of the work.

The professors and instructors in our colleges have also occupied a conspicuous place in our success. The office writes, for instance, to a professor at an Ohio institution that the organizing secretary is passing through Ohio, and the organizing secretary finds awaiting him at that college two meetings before sociology classes, one before the Cosmopolitan Club, one before the faculty club, and one before the entire college body of 1,500; or to a member of a New England college faculty, and a meeting is arranged before the college forum, and the combined logic and economics classes; or to one at another middle western university, and presto, the Society's representative is ushered, on his arrival, before the college chapel of 1,200 students and before three English classes. Or a professor of a Pacific Coast college is communicated with and weekly assembly and Saturday luncheon talks inevitably result.

But one could go on for hours enumerating the many cooperators in this cooperative enterprise. What has been the inspiration of all of these efforts? The desire to awaken the students to the great problems of the day; to arouse them out of their indifference; to give them a vision of the meaning of the great mass movement for industrial democracy; to assist in making them function intelligently in the world drama.

"I went to the University," declared London at Yale. "I found the University in the main, practically wholly so, clean and noble, but I did not find the University alive. I found that the American University had this ideal, as phrased by a professor in the Chicago University, namely: 'The passionless pursuit of passionless intelligence'—clean and noble, I grant you, but not alive enough . . . . . And the reflection of this University ideal I find—the conservatism and unconcern of the American people who are suffering, the people who are in want. And so I became interested in an attempt to arouse in the minds of the young men of our universities an interest in the study of Socialism. . . . We do not desire merely to make converts. . . . . If collegians cannot fight for us, we want them to fight against us—of course, sincerely fight against us. But what we do not want is that which obtains to-day and had obtained in the past of the university, a mere deadness and unconcern and ignorance so far as Socialism is concerned. Fight for us or fight against us. Raise your voices one way or the other; be alive. That is the idea upon which we are working."

We found the university students making up the rear of the social movement. We wished to inspire them with the spirit of the Vanguard, so beautifully expressed by Miss Hughan:

'Tis ours to haste through the desert waste
where the hearts of the strong men fail;
'Tis ours to blaze through hidden ways,
when night has swallowed the trail;
To charge the height in the first wild fight,
when lances meet in the fray;
And count the cost by the leaders lost at
the end of a losing day.

We hark the cry of the souls that die, and
we cheerily spur to aid;
We meet the scorn of the tyrant's horn with
a challenge as unafraid;
And our flag is bright, as in God's own
light, with a white cause new from
birth;
Till we pass it on, with its lustre gone, and
bearing the seal of earth.

Sometimes we hear from the distant rear
the song of the ordered lines,
Where the camp-fire glows and the wassail
flows and the golden booty shines.
And they jeer in scorn at the vanguard
worn, with its scattered ranks and slow,
And they march abreast with a shining
crest, in the way that we bid them go.

And the rest is sweet to our lonely feet in
the world of the beaten track,
And the fireside cheer sounds friendly
clear when comrades call us back;
But we march to greet with the trumpet's
bleat and the sound of the signal drum
The first pale streaks on the mountain
peaks in the land of the kingdom come.

That we are inspiring many hundreds with that ideal goes without saying.

How permanently they are reached it is impossible to tell.

I am continually coming across professors in colleges, ministers, journalists, social workers, and collegians of various professions, formerly members of undergraduate Chapters, who are now doing splendid work in bringing the Socialist or radical point of view before the great unreached public — working, sometimes most quietly, but effectively, nevertheless.

Our work, however, has but just begun. With over 1,300 academic and professional colleges in the country, with a student population of over 250,000, we have a well-nigh unlimited field for future endeavor.

This year we are aiming to celebrate our tenth anniversary of activity by doubling our membership. We therefore ask all who are not members to join and all members to express their appreciation of the work of the Society by bringing into the Society from one to a dozen others.

In conclusion, may we join in the hope of Helen Keller—that most remarkable woman that America has produced:

"May the work of the Society continue to grow. May I be among the great forces that shall transform the bondage, the misery, the cruelty of past ages into the glorious freedom, strength and brotherhood of all men."

Review of Books

THE COST OF LIVING IN NEW YORK STATE. By Frank H. Streightoff, Ph.D. Albany: N. Y. State Factory Investigation Commission.

The object of this detailed report is to inquire into the present conditions of wage earners in the State of New York, in order to show how far these fall below standards of decent living, and furthermore to attempt to fix a minimum wage at which such standards can be maintained.

The inquiries cover the wages and cost of living of single women in the stores and factories of New York State, whether living independently or with their families; the cost of living to independent men, and that for a normal family consisting of a man and wife and three children. The industries investigated are the stores, and the candy, paper box and shirt factories. Food prices, housing conditions, cost of clothing and the necessary reserve for insurance and recreation are discussed in detail, and there is a comparative study of food prices and rents in the five principal cities of New York State. There are also valuable appendices on Living on Six Dollars a Week," by Esther Packard, and "How the Working Girl of New York Lives," by Marie S. Orenstein.

The conclusions arrived at by many authorities concerning the lowest amount on which a decent living can be maintained are duly set forth.

Dr. Streightoff is at great pains to explain the methods used by him in reaching his conclusions and has made every effort to have the report as fair and scientific as possible. The conclusion drawn is that present wages fall far below what is necessary to maintain that standard of living which prevents men and women from becoming a burden to the state. For instance, more than half the store girls and a larger proportion of factory girls in New York City, according to the report, are not earning enough to feed and shelter themselves. A very large proportion of the women, the report maintains, receive under $6 a week; over half earn under $7 a week; two-thirds under $8 and four-fifths under $9. And this, in spite of the fact that "the very least upon which a working woman

can decently maintain herself in that city of the State where rents and food prices seem about the lowest, in Buffalo, is $8.20 per week the year around, and in New York City $9—no special allowance being made in these estimates for a vacation with its extra expense, nor is there any inclusion for savings."

Dr. Streightoff also estimates the minimum for a family and concludes that "there is very little reason for doubting the validity of the estimate of $876 a year in New York City and $772 a year in Buffalo as the minimum cost of mere living for a typical normal family."

The book leaves a profound impression of fundamental weaknesses in present systems by showing that the inability of the workers to support themselves in decency is the result not so much of their inefficiency as of lack of opportunity to use their capacities to the best advantage, crushed as they are by the thoughtlessness, ignorance and selfishness which remain to be wiped out of present business and social systems.

It as well presents a very powerful argument for the immediate establishment of a minimum wage.

I. L. W.

ESSAYS ON SOCIAL JUSTICE. By Professor Thomas Nixon Carver. Harvard University Press. $2.00.

Professor Carver's book refuses to be classified under Economics. Though, as is to be expected, it is full of clear economic thinking and is characterized by that fearlessness of thought which makes professional economists the most radical group in the community, yet his attitude and the problems he discusses are rather more typical of the ethical thinker.

Unlike modern economists such as Marshall, Pigou, Moore and Fisher, who set out on their economic analyses by defining the nature of and then analyzing the National Income, or, as American economists prefer to term it, the National Dividend, Professor Carver is interested in the totally different problem of "which group in all probability will succeed best in expanding, in securing territory, defending its boundaries, and finally in crowding the other communities off the face of the earth."

This return to the fundamental problem of 17th and 18th century political thinking is accompanied by an acknowledgement, implicit rather than explicit, that in problems of statecraft ethics, economics and politics all play important roles. But which of these is fundamental in coloring, if not in controlling the others? Professor Carver writes: "The ultimate basis of all social conflict is found in economic scarcity in one form or another. Around this fact of economic scarcity with its inevitable conflict of interests are grouped practically all our moral ideals, our social, political and legal institutions." Here is one of the keenest thinkers in the country saying in 1915 exactly what Karl Marx wrote in the Communist Manifesto in 1849. "In every historical epoch," wrote Marx, "the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch."

Carver expresses his thoroughgoing acceptance of the materialistic conception of history even more definitely than in the sentence already quoted. "In this antagonism of interests, growing out of scarcity, the institutions of property, of the family, of the state, all have their common origin. Questions of justice and equity arise as a result of it. *The economic problem is the fundamental one, out of which all other social and moral problems have grown.*"

Professor Carver has much else in common with the Socialist. His criticism of the existing state of affairs is as trenchant and as uncompromising as is

that of any orthodox supporter of the dogma of a "class war." And in his searching analysis of "The Distribution of Wealth," he puts his finger on the central economic problem in a modern democracy. He writes:

"Even in the most democratic countries of the present, there is a remnant of the aristocratic theory left in the form of hereditary rights to property. This is aristocratic rather than democratic, in that it assumes that one person, by accident of birth rather than individual merit, has a better right than another to the accumulations of the past."

Moreover, like the Socialist, he believes that poverty is unnecessary with the present amount of the national wealth. He boldly exclaims: "Poverty is as unnecessary as malaria or yellow fever."

Unlike the economist of an earlier date Professor Carver assumes the mantle of the preacher, his teaching being that old New England philosophy of life, plain living and high thinking. Of course, the Harvard Professor is not a Socialist. According to him, "the social problem of the future is to work out a system under which all the people may, without constraint or oppression, each one remaining the master of himself, live on a high level. It is needless to point out that such a result has not yet been achieved, and that it furnishes a prospect so pleasing that such a scheme as Socialism seems like a pitiful makeshift in comparison."

How does he propose to realize his ideal? We are not moving very definitely in that direction. Furthermore, he has little that is good to say about the position of the peasant proprietor "which is usually neither dignified nor on the whole desirable."

His very radical proposal is that "by pursuing *a consistent policy of reducing the supply of unskilled labor,* of increasing the supply of the scarcer kinds of employing talent, as well as the supplies of land and capital, we can, by progressive stages, approach as near to equality of incomes as between occupations as we care to go."

How is this to be attained, one breathlessly asks. But alas, we have been brought to a cul-de-sac. It is here, on the constructive side, that Professor Carver is weakest and needs to be read with the greatest caution. He falls back on a restriction of immigration, on more equal education for all and sounder principles of taxation. The essay form as used in this volume adds a certain freshness and vigor lacking in most treatises. The freedom allowed by this form encourages the use of homely illustrations and of those crisp aphorisms which are the rich fruit of mature and well-stored minds.

Essays in Social Justice are suggestive, stimulating and inspiring; a windfall for the student of social sciences. The Socialist and radical reader will frequently be irritated by the abuse which Professor Carver unhappily heaps upon them, but he will be well advised to ignore this defect in order to find out how much truth there is in the criticism crusted over by that abuse.

J. L. C.

THE CRY FOR JUSTICE: An Anthology of Social Protest. Edited by Upton Sinclair. Phila.: Winston. $2.00.

We all like to find ourselves in good company and to see our convictions endorsed by the spokesmen of our own or any other age. This very human desire is one that Socialists may gratify by browsing in Upton Sinclair's *Anthology of Social Protest.* Here they will find themselves not merely in good company, but in the very best of company. They will feel their pulses quicken and their senses thrill at the daring criticisms and bold challenges flung at the world-old social muddle by the fearless spirits of to-day and of old. They will observe that Meng-tse of China, Plato of Greece, Micah of Palestine, and Morris of England were men of like social passions

with themselves. And they will thank Mr. Sinclair for the patience and enthusiasm with which he has ransacked all sorts of literatures dead and alive in order to bring so many varied and inspiring utterances under a single cover.

It would be a mistake to suppose, however, that we have to listen exclusively to revolutionists and rebels in order to hear the "Cry for Justice." The sorry fact is that this cry has become the height of fashion. One might go far and search long to discover anyone nowadays who does not believe injustice to be a constant and even a normal or necessary factor in a competitive commercial civilization like ours. So that there is actually a sense in which nobody believes in social justice and everybody believes in social injustice.

As cases in point, take our sentimental slum landlords, our industrial, philanthropist slave-drivers, our humanitarian writers on social reform, and our elderly unattached multimillionairesses who flit restlessly from one scheme of poor relief to another. No exercise is more popular with all these classes than scourging the insolent tyranny of the rich, lamenting the abject wretchedness of the poor, or deploring the chasm between those who sport an income and those who earn one. Does not the *Anthology* itself contain "Social Protests" from the Tory Dr. Johnson, the Conservative Thomas Gray, and the stand-pat Reactionary Edmund Burke? Quite sincere social protests, too, mind you (from the benevolent aristocratic point of view), and not self-exploding bits of sanctimony, like the pious little speeches by John D. Rockefeller and ex-President Taft, which Mr. Sinclair has cleverly slipped in as foils to more genuine expressions of revolt.

Quotations from the writers of antiquity are rather numerous, and not the least astonishing thing about them is their modernity. The Hebrew prophets in their fieriest radical moments talk surprisingly like the leaders of the I. W. W., Jeremiah alone pouring hot shot into the merchants and business men of his time, quite in the manner of Jim Larkin or Arturo Giovanitti. Plato, again, sounds very much like H. G. Wells in his finest, most generous, least spiteful mood. And Chrysostom's terse exposure of the maldistribution of wealth reads like a page out of the stanchest social writings of William Morris. All this is stirring and arresting enough. But after the first glow of enthusiasm has gone, it is with considerable misgiving that we count the long centuries down which the social protest has been ringing. For the profit foots up to naught, and the "Cry of Justice" often sounds painfully like a professional whine.

When you come to think of it, justice is really no watchword for a democratic people at all, and the courageous man scornfully rejects its use as a call to arms. The very elements agree with him. They always behave with strict injustice, the sun shining on the good and the bad alike. If we took our cue from nature, therefore, we should ask not that justice but that injustice be evenly dispensed. However, we might as well go nature one better, and scrap justice and injustice both, just as we have already scrapped the chivalrous gentleman and as we shall presently scrap the private industrial employer. For we must bear in mind that the only social currency that justice has to-day is of an eleemosynary kind. It regularly implies an inferior person asking for what should never be bestowed, or a superior person bestowing what should never be asked for. Accordingly, a modern freeman no more cries for justice than for the moon. He strives for power: power to purchase his material needs, power to assert his instinct towards perfection, and power to put a well constituted personality at the service of the community.

Now I don't deny that this affirmative spirit is represented in the Anthology. But it isn't represented with emphasis.

By far the majority of the selections are such as to excite our hatred of the rich, our pity for the poor, and our horror at the foulness of the social order. This is good as far as it goes. But it doesn't go far enough. An anthology for revolutionists must do more than arouse a man's anger, sorrow, or disgust. It must touch his conscience, his energy, and his courage.

I think we will have to regard Mr. Sinclair's book as the first draft of a splendid idea. In the later drafts (or editions) we shall look for some drastic discarding, and for at least one noteworthy addition. Mr. Sinclair ought to supplement his seventeen well-chosen sections with a section on Equality. This, it is true, is an ancient subject. It has invited almost as much vague rhetoric as the flaming iniquities of the upper ten or the doleful miseries of the submerged half. Still, when all is said and done, it is equality in some form or other that "Social Protesters" are after. And as modern thinkers have proposed a very concrete and practical way of transcending the inequalities that flesh and blood inherit or that circumstances create, a chapter of selections on Tangible Equality is sure to be read with furious absorption. If the editor adds this chapter, he can hardly do better than lead off with a commanding passage from the preface to *Major Barbara* and with William Morris' famous, laconic explanation of how to run a ship under Socialism.

FELIX GRENDON.

THE EDUCATION OF TO-MORROW, THE ADAPTION OF SCHOOL CURRICULA TO AN ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY. By Arland D. Weeks, M. A. N. Y.: Sturgis and Walton. $1.25.

Mr. Weeks describes as the education of to-morrow that education which to-day has need of. After declaring that the object of education is to fit men to cope with their environment, he discusses that object in the light of a generalization which has helped to clarify men's thinking in other fields—namely, that men in their relations to their environment are concerned with production, distribution and consumption. The man who is to cope successfully with his environment and live a life satisfactory to himself and the group of which he is a part, must do his share as producer, distributor and consumer. With this for clue, Mr. Weeks proceeds to consider the value of various types of education and accomplishments and the agencies for their diffusion with the conclusion that no other agency can take the place of a well-balanced school curriculum planned to equip students for functioning well in all three capacities. And he points out that the effect of such a curriculum should be not only to meet the immediate needs of the rising generation, but to make of them thoroughly good citizens, dissatisfied with unjust and detrimental methods and equipped to work out something better.

Although some ill-balanced curricula are quoted and a preferable substitute proposed, there is no discussion of concrete educational problems. The book contains some two hundred pages, and by keeping strictly to his thesis Mr. Weeks is able not only to state his criticisms and proposals in some detail but implicitly to convey to the reader the democratic conception that gives point to his whole contention.

There seems on the face of it to be some serious dangers involved in the curriculum proposed but, considerable as they are, they are by no means inseperable from the main tendencies of Mr. Weeks's lucid and definitive suggestions. The soundness of the proposal deliberately to fit the rising generation to grapple with its task of continuing the democratization of the nation and the advancement of its ideals speaks for itself and bespeaks attention for the book.

ALICE S. CHEYNEY.

BERNARD SHAW ON AMERICAN PREPAREDNESS

[The following was received in response to an inquiry as to whether Mr. Shaw expected to be in America this winter and would speak under the auspices of the Society. The readers of the Intercollegiate Socialist need hardly be reminded that it has been the policy of the I. S. S. to present, so far as possible, all important points of view within the Socialist movement. The Society neither endorses nor opposes Mr. Shaw's position.]

I have no intention of visiting the United States this year. If I did, I am afraid you would hesitate to welcome me on your platform. I should strenuously recommend the United States to build thirty-two new dreadnoughts instead of sixteen, and to spend two billion dollars on its armament program instead of one. This would cost only a fraction of the money you are wasting every year in demoralizing luxury, a good deal of it having been in the past scattered over the continental countries which are now using what they saved out of it to slaughter one another.

If the United States wishes to stop war as an institution; that is, to undertake the policing of the world, it will need a very big club for the purpose. It is possible, however, now that the belligerents are bleeding to death so rapidly that the only question to be decided is which side will be first exhausted, that the United States might not only induce them to state the terms on which they will consent to make peace, but even to co-operate in establishing supernational institutions which will provide an alternative to war, and even deal with war as a crime. Until then, the United States can decline to enter the race for the biggest armament only at the risk of finding itself where Britain would have been to-day if it had refused to keep ahead of the German fleet. It is true that at present the Pacifism of America is the hope of the world; but it is because America is powerful as well as pacific that she will be listened to. If I were an American statesman, I should tell the country flatly that it should maintain a Pacific navy capable of resisting an attack from Japan and an Atlantic navy capable of resisting an attack from England, with Zeppelins on the same scale, a proportionate land equipment of siege guns and so forth. And until the nations see the suicidal folly of staking everything in the last instance on the ordeal of battle, no other advice will be honest advice.

G. Bernard Shaw.

10 Adelphi Terrace, London, W. C.

In The Colleges

NEW ENGLAND STATES

The HARVARD Socialist Club, for the past six months, has been carrying on a remarkable series of Sunday meetings on the Boston Common with an attendance from 300 to 500. The Club is looking forward to a great year. Among the speakers booked are Dr. Nearing, Frank Walsh, Morris Hillquit, Max Eastman, Mrs. Kelley. It unites for these meetings with the RADCLIFFE club. A. C. Binder is president and Boris Stern secretary.

The YALE Chapter has held two successful meetings, with Frederick C. Howe on "Why War: The War Makers and the War Traders," and Mme. Aino Malmberg on "The Small Nations and Socialism." Robt. W. Dunn is secretary.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES

The BARNARD Socialist Club reports three meetings, addressed by Juliet Stuart Poyntz, Mrs. Anita Block and John Spargo, the latter having been held in conjunction with the Columbia Chapter and having an attendance of 225. Future meetings are being planned at which Professor Charles A. Beard and Scott Nearing will speak. Doris Maddon is secretary.

A promising Chapter has been formed at the BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL of Middletown, Conn., every student in the school signing the application for a charter. W. B. Spafford was elected chairman and Horace Fort, secretary. John Spargo will probably address the Chapter in January.

According to a by-law adopted by the Board of Trustees of C. C. N. Y., each society must present a copy of its constitution to the Committee appointed by the President. Said Committee practically controls all affairs of the society, granting or refusing permission for meetings and speakers. The C. C. N. Y. Socialist Club has submitted its constitution, and pending action by the Trustees, the President has granted them a return of all former privileges. Four meetings have been held, the first one addressed by Juliet S. Poyntz. Solo-

mon Lasky, the secretary, writes: "The attendance at the lecture of Miss Poyntz was the greatest the college has known for quite a long time. The Socialist Society is now being regarded as the model by all other societies in the college." The other three meetings were addressed by members of the club on "Will Social Reform Hinder or Help the Growth of Socialism?", "Will Socialism Come Through the Middle Class or Working Class?" and "Socialism and Religion." Professor Charles P. Fagnani is scheduled to speak in the future.

The NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF COMMERCE Chapter held a meeting in October with Juliet S. Poyntz on "Socialism and Woman Suffrage."

A poster, used in announcing lectures of the COLUMBIA Socialist Club, picturing a student busily engaged in dusting the cobwebs off the books in the University library, caused lively discussion this Fall. Some of the students took the poster so much to heart that it was discarded in subsequent meetings. Professor Charles P. Fagnani of Union Theological Seminary was the first speaker of the year, and William English Walling spoke on October 27th on "Nationalism and Internationalism." John Spargo, Dr. Frederick C. Howe, Scott Nearing and Mrs. Florence Kelley are to come. The club has a membership of 100 and is planning the most active year of its existence. Wayne Wellman is president and Charles Phillips secretary. As a result of the suggestion of the Chapter, two sessions of the I. S. S. Convention will be held in Columbia.

The CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY Economic Society is circulating a leaflet in a membership campaign. John Spargo and Wm. A. Prosser addressed the Chapter. The University of PITTSBURGH Chapter is also starting a membership campaign. J. O. Mills of Equal Franchise League, and John Spargo are among the year's speakers.

On account of the 50th anniversary celebration, the VASSAR club was unable to organize early in the year. The Chapter is looking forward to an active season. Gertrude Folks is the chairman and Ruth Lamb the secretary. Jessie W. Hughan spoke on November 15th and Harry W. Laidler is scheduled for December 13th. There are 89 paid-up members.

MIDDLE WEST

The UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO Chapter held its last meeting on October 14th. Bi-monthly meetings are held—one a study meeting, the other a public lecture. Horace J. Bridges, President of the Chicago Ethical Society, spoke on November 3rd, and it is hoped to secure Mr. Hourwich, Mr. Laidler and Mr. Spargo.

The LA CROSSE NORMAL SCHOOL Chapter is taking up a course in Elements of Socialism from the Rand School of Social Science, and future meetings are being planned. A membership campaign has been started.

The KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL College Chapter has been meeting regularly since college opened, and is now studying the peace and war problems. The Chapter expects to increase greatly before the year is out.

TheVALPARAISO Chapter held a successful meeting with an attendance of about 200. John C. Kennedy spoke on "The Struggle for Freedom of Speech and Thought in American Colleges and Universities."

Frederick Tilton, secretary of the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS Chapter, reports good meetings with Professor Hayes, H. Amsterdam and Mr. Laidler. Mr. Amsterdam related the experience of a Russian revolutionary Socialist, and Mr. Laidler spoke on "Socialism—A New Loyalty for the College-bred." Vachel Lindsay, the Illinois poet, gave a short talk, interspersed with recitals of his poems among others, "Why I Voted the Socialist Ticket," at a tea given for him by the Society on Nov. 3rd.

John Spargo addressed an audience of 250 at OHIO WESLEYAN. J. L. Goble, the president, addressed a meeting on "The Purpose of the Local Chapter of I. S. S." The Chapter at OHIO STATE has been re-organized recently. Mr. Spargo spoke under the auspices of the Political Science Club before 1,500. The TEMPLE University Chapter was addressed by John Spargo on "The Real Meaning of Socialism." The Chapter reports progress.

SOUTH

W. J. Sidis and H. W. Freeman are making efforts to organize a Chapter at RICE INSTITUTE. In all probability Rice will soon fall in line.

John Spargo had two successful meetings at HOWARD UNIVERSITY. Efforts are under way to re-organize the RICHMOND COLLEGE Chapter.

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

An Alumni Chapter has been formed at DETROIT, with Maurice Sugar chairman and Joseph D. Page secretary. A newspaper column tells us that 20 new members have been added to the original five.

The CHICAGO Alumni Chapter is trying to get up a sectional conference on December 4th and 6th. John Spargo and William English Walling will be the principal speakers. The WASHINGTON, D. C., Chapter arranged a meeting for Mr. Spargo in November. The NEW YORK Chapter has had a successful small dinner at the Rand School in honor of J. Stitt Wilson, former mayor of Berkeley, Cal. On December 2nd a study meeting will be held on "Utopian Socialism. My Conception of a Co-operative Commonwealth." Dr.

Jessie W. Hughan, Walter Lippmann and William English Walling will be the speakers, Marie Jenney Howe will act as chairman. The meeting on December 16th will deal with "The New Economics and Socialism," with Professor Scott Nearing as speaker and J. G. Phelps Stokes as chairman.

The NEW ENGLAND COMMITTEE held its first meeting of the year on November 7th at which plans for the year were discussed.

Mr. Spargo's trip began on Monday, November 1st, with fine meetings at Columbia and Union Theological Seminary. Three hundred were present at Columbia. At Union Theologue the attendance was 50, "but a great meeting. It was pentecostal," writes Mr. Spargo. From New York he went to Philadelphia and had excellent meetings at Temple University and at the University of Pennsylvania, where the audience numbered about 250. The subject was "Socialism and the War."

At Swarthmore Mr. Spargo evidently made a very fine impression. The subject of the first lecture, from 1 to 2 P. M., was "Socialism and the War," with President Swain presiding; from 2 to 3 "The Real Meaning of Socialism," and from 3 to 4 questions on the two lectures. There were about 175 at each of the lectures and about 100 for the question period. That evening Mr. Spargo spoke with Scott Nearing to a crowded audience at the new School of Social Science in Philadelphia.

Next he went to Howard University and spoke to about 200 students and some citizens on "The Real Meaning of Socialism." The president of the college presided and about 25 new members were added. The following morning he lectured before Professor Parks' class with other students—70 in all— on "Class Consciousness and Its Relation to Race Consciousness." Mr. Spargo sent a list of names of those most interested in the George Washington Chapter, though he was not able to go there.

At Richmond the meeting was in the John Marshall High School, the first time a real Socialist had ever spoken there. It was an audience of about 125, including many leading educators, most of whom were cordial. An application was taken out for a Charter.

From Richmond Mr. Spargo went to Baltimore, where the interest was profound. The Saturday meeting at the City Club was attended by 500. The Sunday afternoon meeting at a theatre was crowded and 200 were turned away. That evening a large meeting was held in the Parish House of the Church of the Ascension on the subject of Poverty; the audience is described as a very thoughtful one and made up of influential people. At the Carnegie Technical School he spoke to 225 students and a good faculty representation. Dean Willetts was in the chair and urged the students to join the Chapter. A visit was made to Pittsburgh University, when Mr. Spargo spoke to the assembly of the economic school with a full attendance of the faculty, Dean Hollingsworth presiding, with an attendance of about 400. The subject was "Some of the Economic Problems Which the Close of the War Will Bring."

At Washington-Jefferson a good meeting was held with an attendance of 78, of whom 55 were students. Several of the faculty were present and a temporary organization affected.

Mr. Laidler left for a tour among the colleges November 4th, and first visited Chicago, where he saw those prominent in the Alumni Chapter regarding a sectional conference to be held in early December. On the 5th he reached Bloomington, Ill., and spoke before the State Normal College to about 125 students on "Principles and Achievements of Modern Socialism." The students show keen interest and several of the professors are assisting in forming a Chapter.

On November 6th Mr. Laidler addressed about 40 members of the faculty club of the Illinois State University, on "Socialism in the College and Academic Freedom." There are about 20 faculty members and 20 undergraduates in the I. S. S. Chapter. It hopes to contribute a University of Illinois Supplement to the magazine. On Sunday noon a little dinner was given at the university club, where 14 members of the faculty and several students discussed, informally, Socialist problems. That afternoon Mr. Laidler spoke under the auspices of the Chapter in the Unitarian Church on "Socialism: A New Loyalty to the College-bred." About 100 were present and a good discussion followed. The Chapter here is planning to take up the National Party Lecture Course and hopes later to have Mr. Walling and Mrs. Stokes speak to them. Professor Hayes of the Economics Course will probably become an endorser. On Monday Mr. Laidler spoke before the labor problems class on "The Labor Struggles and Its Remedy" to about 25 students.

From Champaign Mr. Laidler went to Decatur, where, on Tuesday, he addressed about 40 students and members of the faculty at James Milliken College before the sociology class of Prof. W. W. Smith. The attendance was good and included both young men and girls.

On Wednesday, the 10th, Mr. Laidler arrived in Jacksonville, Ill., where he spoke on suffrage in the college chapel of the Woman's College before 150 students and women of Jacksonville. He dined with the president and members of the faculty and addressed about 250 students and faculty members on "The Ideals and Achievements of Modern Socialism." The faculty remained to discuss the I. S. S. and the dean promised to find whether there was enough interest to support a Chapter. The president of the college was a miner in England from the age of 10 to 18 and later a miner in Illinois. He became a school teacher before he had attended school as a student, and a professor in a college before he had entered college as a student. Mr. Laidler breakfasted with members of the faculty and left Jacksonville for Shurtleff College, Alton, Ill., where, on the afternoon of the 11th, he spoke before Professor Baker's class on "Socialism."

He arrived in St. Louis that evening and went to Lebanon Friday to speak to about 200 students of the McKendrie College at the chapel exercises. It is hoped soon to revive the St. Louis Alumni Chapter. Mr. Laidler was to leave Saturday night for some of the Iowa colleges.

FINANCIAL REPORT
1914-1915

Receipts

Dues	$1,079.25
Special Contributions	4,840.50
Literature	65.92
Intercollegiate Socialist	292.55
Miscellaneous	122.79
	$6,401.01
Balance from last year	7.08
	$6,408.09

Expenditures

Rent	$564.96
Telephone	83.98
Printing	470.00
Postage, Express, Etc	490.00
Literature	119.30
Salaries	3,234.42
Organizers in Field	403.34
Office Supplies	107.09
Intercollegiate Socialist	510.49
Carnegie Hall Meeting Deficit	228.14
Miscellaneous	95.01
	$6,306.73
Balance to 1915-16	$5.00
Subscribed and Reserved for Spring I. S.	96.36

THE ROLL OF HONOR

Note:—The following is an incomplete list of fifty colleges, at which courses in Socialism are given:

Arkansas—University of Arkansas; **California**—Leland Stanford Junior University, Pomona College; **Connecticut**—Yale University; **Colorado**—Colorado College, University of Colorado, University of Denver; **Delaware**—Delaware College; **Georgia**—Agnes Scott College; **Illinois**—De Paul University, University of Illinois, Northwestern University, Western College; **Indiana**—Indiana University, De Pauw University, Wabash College; **Iowa**—Buena Vista College, State University of Iowa; **Kansas**—Ottawa University; **Louisiana**—Louisiana State University; **Massachusetts**—Boston University, Harvard University, Mt. Holyoke College, Smith College; **Michigan**—Albion College; **Minnesota**—Carlton College, Hamline University; **Missouri**—University of Missouri, William Jewell College; **Nebraska**—Doane College, University of Nebraska; **New York**—Columbia University, Hobart College, University of Rochester, Syracuse University, Vassar College; **North Dakota**—University of North Dakota; **Ohio**—Antioch College, Cedarville College, Heidelberg University,

Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Otterbein University, Western Reserve University; **Pennsylvania**—Allegheny College; **Rhode Island**—Brown University; **Virginia**—Randolph Macon Women's College; **Washington**—University of Puget Sound; **Wisconsin**—Lawrence College, University of Wisconsin.

At least 77 colleges responding to a questionnaire declared that the subject of Socialism was discussed for several lectures each year in connection with their courses on "Labor Problems," "Sociology," "Economics," etc.

The text-books and books for collateral reading most frequently referred to in these courses were:—Spargo's "Socialism," Hillquit's "Socialism in Theory and Practice," Spargo and Arner's "Elements of Socialism," Ely's "Socialism and Social Reform," Skelton's "Socialism—a Critical Analysis," and Marx's "Communist Manifesto."

The following books were mentioned at least twice: Hughan's "American Socialism of the Present Day," Kirkup's "History of Socialism," and "Inquiry into Socialism," Le Rossignol's "Orthodox Socialism," Rauschenbusch's "Christianity and the Social Crisis," Engel's "Socialism from Utopia to Science," Cross' "Essentials of Socialism," Bernstein's "Evolutionary Socialism" and Hunter's "Socialists at Work."

Other books mentioned were Simkhovitch's "Marxism vs. Socialism," Weyl's "The New Democracy," Kautsky's "Social Revolution," Marx's "Capital", Vedder's "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus," Orth's "Socialism and Democracy in Europe," Bellamy's "Looking Backward," Guthrie's "Socialism before the French Revolution".

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST, published bi-monthly, excepting June, July, August, September, at New York, N. Y., required by the Act of August 24, 1912. Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Managing Editor, Harry W. Laidler, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Business Manager, A. K. Boehme, 70 Fifth Ave, New York City. Publisher, Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. Owners: Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City. Membership approximately 2,000. The principal officers are: President, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Stamford, Conn.; 1st Vice-President, Florence Kelley, 6 E. 39th St., N. Y. C.; 2nd Vice-President, Ernest Poole, 130 E. 67th St., N. Y. C.; Treasurer, Mary R. Sanford, 90 Grove St., N. Y. C.; Secretary, Leroy Scott, 84 Grove St., N. Y. C.

There are no known bondholders, mortgagees or other security holders.

Alice Kuebler Boehme.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 16th day of March, 1915.

John Martin, Notary Public, Bronx County. No. 7.

Certificate filed in New York County. Register's No. 7185.

(My commission expires March 30, 1917.)